REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search.

Claim 18 has been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. Hence, Claims 1-46 are pending in the application.

Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed July 2, 2007 is addressed hereinafter.

I.   REJECTION OF CLAIM 18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 18 was rejected as allegedly indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claim 18 has been amended herein to recite:

in response to a user manipulating a component associated with a page, a portlet
that <u>previously generated</u> the component generating a particular event;

This amendment to Claim 18 clarifies that the portlet generating the particular event is the <u>same</u> portlet that previously generated the component. Thus, this amendment to Claim 18 makes it clear that a portlet generates a particular event in response to a user manipulating a component, where the portlet is that same portlet which previously generated the component. In addition, this amendment to Claim 18 makes it clear that the same portlet generates <u>both</u> the component and the particular event but at different times.

It is noted that even before this amendment, Claim 18 clearly covered a portlet-generated component that is configured to receive user input; when user input is received by such component, it is the portlet that had generated the component which responds to the user input (e.g., by generating an event). For this reason, it is respectfully submitted that the amendment to Claim 18 does not change the scope of the claim, but merely clarifies an already existing feature by using the verb "generate" in the past tense.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendment to Claim 18 fully addresses the rejection in the final Office Action. Entry of this amendment and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 18

11

under 35 U.S.C § 112 is respectfully requested in order to remove an issue for the purposes of appeal.

II.   ISSUES RELATED TO THE CITED ART

    A.   INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

Claim 1 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Abrams et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,675,350 ("ABRAMS") in view of Hofmann et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0009016 ("HOFMANN"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As a preliminary matter, the Applicants respectfully note that the final Office Action fails to state <u>exactly what elements</u> in ABRAMS correspond to each of the features of Claim 1 of a page parameter, a component of the page, a portlet that generates the component of the page, a portlet parameter based on which the portlet generates the component of the page, and most importantly a <u>mapping</u> that maps a page parameter to a portlet parameter. In light of this failure of the Office Action, the Applicants have had to engage in guesswork to determine the basis of the rejection of Claim 1. The Applicants cannot see any elements in ABRAMS that correspond to <u>ALL</u> of the above features of Claim 1.

For brevity, only the following feature of Claim 1 will be discussed:

…;
inspecting a mapping to determine that the page parameter is mapped to a portlet
    parameter of a portlet that generates a component of the page that is based, at least
    in part, on the portlet parameter;
… .

Contrary to the assertion in the final Office Action, the above feature is not described or suggested by ABRAMS because ABRAMS does not describe any elements that correspond to <u>ALL</u> elements of the above feature of Claim 1.

The rejection of Claim 1 in the present final Office Action is based on the assertion that the portlet featured in Claim 1 corresponds to display area 630 of Fig. 6 of ABRAMS. The rejection of Claim 1 in the previous Office Action was based on the assertion that the portlet featured in Claim 1 corresponded to window pane 260 in Fig. 2A of ABRAMS. Both of these assertions are incorrect because a window display area and a window pane cannot possibly be equivalent to a portlet that <u>generates</u> a component of a page.

In making the above assertions, and as expressly stated, the final Office Action also equates the <u>portlet parameter</u> of Claim 1 to user-specified data that is used by an HTML parser to parse a page. Even if this is an accurate analogy (which it is not!), it is not clear what would be the <u>page</u> parameter of Claim 1. Obviously, the elements from ABRAMS that correspond to a portlet parameter and a page parameter cannot be the same element because if they were a mapping between them would not need to be inspected to figure out which page parameter corresponds to which portlet parameter. However, the final Office Action asserts <u>BOTH</u> that the "specification data is the page parameter data" (final Office Action, page 25, line 5) <u>and</u> that user-specified data is portlet parameters (see final Office Action, page 25, lines 8-9 "user specified data (portlet parameters)"). In contrast, Claim 1 provides the feature of inspecting a mapping to determine that a page parameter is mapped to a portlet parameter. Therefore, since the user-specified data cannot be both the portlet parameter and the page parameter, and there is nothing else in ABRAMS that describes a <u>mapping</u> between such parameters, ABRAMS cannot possibly describe or suggest the above feature of Claim 1.

Finally, by asserting that portlet parameters and page parameters correspond to user-specified "<u>data</u>", the final Office Action fails to recognize the difference between a "parameter" and a "parameter value" – which is that a parameter can take on different values. For example, Claim 1 not only features a page parameter and a portlet parameter that are separate, but also

13

clearly states that each of the page parameter and the portlet parameter can be associated with a value.

For the reasons given above, ABRAMS and HOFMANN do not describe or suggest all features of Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of HOFMANN. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

B.   INDEPENDENT CLAIM 18

Claim 18 was apparently rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly anticipated by ABRAMS in view of HOFMANN, even though the final Office Action did not provide any citations to HOFMANN in the rejection. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As a preliminary matter, the Applicants respectfully note that the final Office Action fails to state exactly what elements in ABRAMS correspond to each of the features of Claim 18 of an event, a portlet that generates an event in response to a user manipulating a component, a logic associated with a page to which a portlet passes data representing a generated event, and most importantly a first mapping that maps events to actions and event output parameters to page parameters. In light of this failure of the Office Action, the Applicants have had to engage in guesswork to determine the basis of the rejection of Claim 18. The Applicants cannot see any elements in ABRAMS that correspond to ALL of the above features of Claim 18.

For brevity, only the following features of Claim 18 will be discussed:

… ;
inspecting a first mapping that maps events to actions and event output parameters to
        page parameters;
determining, based on the first mapping and the passed data, an action to perform in
        response to the particular event;
inspecting the first mapping to determine that an event output parameter associated with
        the particular event is mapped to a page parameter;
… .

Thus, Claim 18 features a first mapping that maps portlet-generated events to actions <u>and</u> also maps event output parameters to page parameters. Claim 18 also comprises the feature of inspecting the first mapping to determine that an event output parameter associated with a particular event is mapped to a page parameter.

As described above with respect to Claim 1, ABRAMS does not describe or suggest page parameters or a mapping that involves such page parameters. Further, ABRAMS does not describe or suggest a mapping that maps <u>BOTH</u> events to actions <u>AND</u> event output parameters to page parameters. In fact, the Applicants cannot see any elements in ABRAMS that correspond to <u>event parameters</u> of events that are generated by a portlet.

For the reasons given above, ABRAMS and HOFMANN do not describe or suggest all features of Claim 18. Thus, the Claim 18 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of HOFMANN. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 18 is respectfully requested.

C.   DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-17 AND 19-46

Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17, 19-26, 28, 30-31, 36-37, and 39-46 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of HOFMANN. Claims 4, 6, 27, and 29 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of HOFMANN and further in view of Hind et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0205555 ("HIND"). Claims 9-12 and 32-35 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of HOFMANN further in view of HIND and further in view of Burnard et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,613,122 ("BURNARD"). Claims 15 and 38 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of HOFMANN and further in view of Katariya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,564,251 ("KATARIYA").

Each of Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17, 19-26, 28, 30-31, 36-37, and 39-46 depends directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1 and 18, and thus includes each and every feature of the independent base claim. Furthermore, in rejecting Claims 4, 6, 9-12, 15, 27, 29, 32-35, and 38 the Office Action relies explicitly on ABRAMS and HOFMANN, and not on HIND, BURNARD or KATARIYA, to show the features discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 18. Because ABRAMS does not teach the subject matter of Claims 1 and 18, any combination of ABRAMS and HOFMANN with the other three references necessarily fails to teach the complete combination recited in any dependent claim of Claims 1 or 18. Thus, each of Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17, 19-26, 28, 30-31, 36-37, and 39-46 is allowable for the reasons given above for Claims 1 and 18.

In addition, each of Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17, 19-26, 28, 30-31, 36-37, and 39-46 introduces one or more additional features that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17, 19-26, 28, 30-31, 36-37, and 39-46 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claims 1 and 18. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17, 19-26, 28, 30-31, 36-37, and 39-46 is respectfully requested.

III. CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed. Further, for the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

16

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If applicable, a law firms check for the petition for extension of time fee is enclosed herewith. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: September 4, 2007

/StoychoDDraganoff#56181/
Stoycho D. Draganoff
Reg. No. 56,181

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 208
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076